DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 710 TM 009 752

AUTHOR Bayder, Nicholas F.
TITLE Public Outcry for Humane Evaluation and Isomorphic Validity. Draft.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
PUB DATE 30 Jan 79
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (62nd, Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Humanistic Education; Open Education; Parent Attitudes; Self Esteem; Special Education; Standardized Tests; *Student Evaluation; Testing; *Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Evaluation Problems; *Isomorphic Validity

ABSTRACT

The point of view is presented that evaluation procedures should be more humanistic and, that where educational procedures are open or humanistic, evaluation procedures must also be humanistic in order to be isomorphically valid. A number of quotations from parents of school children are presented to support the position that the parents feel their children may be misclassified or not properly treated as a result of evaluation procedures. There are also three quotations from professional educators. There is a list of 12 guidelines for humanistic evaluation and a table of eight contrasts between the form of experience in an open education model and the form of experience in a standardized testing model. There is another table describing three models of educational programs reflecting differences in underlying values and objectives for education. It is proposed that evaluation programs should reflect the same values and objectives as the educational programs they are being used to evaluate; that is, they should be isomorphically valid. It is further proposed that a humanistic approach and isomorphic validity are especially important when children with disabilities are integrated into regular classrooms. (Author/CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187710

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

January 30, 1979 Draft

THE PUBLIC OUTCRY FOR HUMANE EVALUATION

AND

ISOMORPHIC VALIDITY*

by Nicholas F. Rayder, Ph.D.
Far West Educational Laboratory
San Francisco, Ca.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K HARMS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Introduction/Overview

This paper contains two main themes. The first discusses the public outcry for more humanistic evaluation. Some of the concerns associated with evaluation procedure are cited. As a summary, evaluators are presented with principles to insure compliance with a more humane approach to data collection, processing and reporting.

The second part of the paper presents the evaluator with a new principle of validity. This principle, named "Isomorphic Validity," is described, then related to educational evaluation methodology. Other methodologies that are supportive of, consistent with, and/or extensions of the Isomorphic Validity principle are presented. These newer directions broaden the evaluator's repertoire of thought and methodology and help insure fair and appropriate evaluation.

Part I

No other aspect of the educational process has caused more anguish to students, more confusion for parents, and more consternation from school personnel than have evaluation methods.

*Parts of this paper were presented at the 1978 national convention of the Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada (session 18.18).

TM009 752

JUN 2 1980

As a result of the current methods of educational evaluation, students are subjected to personally and educationally inappropriate, even inhumane procedures to test their abilities. Teachers who are constrained to carry out the "standardized" methods and procedures required of them by evaluators and school administrators are generally less than enthusiastic about the ends and methods involved. Even administrators are frequently confused by the methodology, massive data pools, and voluminous research reports that result from testing and evaluation efforts. Caught in the middle are the parents.

Parents are the most vulnerable pawns of educational evaluation, for they neither understand it nor are involved in its implementation.

How are some of these fears and concerns articulated? The following verbatim comments about tests were generated from parents of elementary-aged students:*

> "Well, I have been a tester. Several things I have seen... I feel that possibly they should...if they're going to give tests, let the teacher or teaching assistant or whatever give the child a test, because a child is frightened. Some children are frightened of strange people coming into the classroom and then the teacher will have to go out of the classroom for these people to test them and some children in the primary grades have the security of the teacher or teaching assistant in the room with them constantly. They look around the room even if the teacher's already told them to be good or whatever, then they look around and the teacher's not there, then they just, you know...they just won't take the test. And then I guess whatever response the child will give, that's what the tester has to give."

> "...parents as well as children should be told a little bit more, when they are to be tested. First of all, to get the cooperation of a child...sometimes if you explain to a child why you want to do things with him, (he) will cooperate better and give you a better testing situation. I know that with my little girl, she is the type that if you explain to her what you are doing or why you want to do it, she will cooperate alot of times on a much better basis than she would if you had not. And one of the things that I dislike about testing is that I never know when they are going to test my child. I think that parents should know this."

*These parents were from seven different states in school districts implementing the Far West Educational Laboratory's Responsive Follow Through Program. Some parents had worked as test monitors as part of the national evaluation of Follow Through.

Another parent speaking out on how tests are used:

> "I feel they're (tests) being used to put kids in categories... In my district, they have a program they call the High Potential program and there are certain kids teachers recommend to be tested for the High Potential program and these kids are supposed to be able to achieve more than maybe some of the other kids. What they're testing...alot of times they're testing situations that alot of kids haven't been exposed to, and so they're not ready. These kids might not be so High Potential or so much better than another kid who has not had the exposure. So tests are used in many different ways. I know that some are to evaluate a program; you maybe have to test to see how your program is working so that, uh, if its necessary to make changes, you know what changes to make. If they're used in this way, that's one thing, but to use them to categorize kids on the basis of how they will perform in school for the rest of their school life is unfair because the kid gets placed in a certain category that goes from one grade to the next -- 'He is below grade level.' 'She or he is above grade level.' And I don't like this."

On how test scores are used:

> "I also think the parent should have a right to know what these test scores are going to be used for. For instance, for certain federal programs in order to get money you have to show that you're doing something, and the only way to show that you're doing something is to show that these kids started out at a certain point and now they're at [sic] here, so in order to do that you have to test. But I would feel that parents should be informed when testing is going to be given to the children; they should be told why they're being tested and be able to say, 'OK, if it's going to be used in order to create money to do a program that you're doing for my kid, you know, that's fine. But it it's going to be used to categorize my child then don't.' I feel we have the right to make that decision depending on how we feel about it."

About test items:

> "...on one of the (the test item) it might say, 'Where would you find a lion?' Well then naturally you wouldn't say 'On a building.' But how many old buildings might you see with, you know, a lion laying on a building? You know, the pillar or whatever you call it. The mother might say, 'Where's a lion?' The child might say, 'On a building.' The child's supposed to say, 'In a jungle.' I mean, it's things like that."

About psychological tests:

> "And then we have the teachers! Look at Johnny, because Johnny won't sit down and Johnny runs around the classroom they run a psychological test. Something is wrong with Johnny...something is wrong with Johnny, so you send him to get these little tests and your child doesn't have to pay anything to the testers so the psychologist says your Johnny has to go to a special

education class, so the next thing you do is call the family. We have decided that your child would be better off in a special education classroom. There are parents who don't even know what special education is...so they sign the paper not knowing, and you know there's about 15 kids in the class doing nothing, because some of them don't teach anything with paper...and comic books all day and their child never learns anything."

"What irks me is these special education kids. You talk about... these kids are labeled. Everyone here knows there's something wrong with your...he's in special education. Now they categorize these kids..."

At a post-AERA invitational conference titled "Educational Evaluation and Public Policy: A More Humanistic Approach,"* other comments were made by participants concerning testing and evaluation:

(From an elementary school teacher and author)

HERBERT KOHL: "Evaluation simply means deciding what is of value in a specific situation. However...who decides what is of value? This is a major question for educational evaluators. There are parents, students, teachers, administrators, and school board members to be considered. In many communities the values of these groups are not the same. For example, in Berkeley there are major differences in the kind of education different groups of parents value for their children...Some parents value the freedom provided by libertarian education; others are skill-obsessed. Some students disagree with their parents about what is of value in the schools, and some school board members believe they know what is of value for all children. ...Add to this teachers who do not believe they should be evaluated but rather that the burden of evaluation should fall on the material used, and the burden of failure should be put on the student or the parent or the administration. Then throw in teachers who believe they serve the parents and have to be evaluated on the basis of what the parents want, and administrators who do not want to be evaluated so much as to control the evaluation process, and one gets a notion of the complexity and political nature of discerning who has the power to set values, and deciding who should have the power to set values.

I believe that neither teachers nor administrators nor social scientists should have the power to set values for other people's children. All of these people are workers who serve a community. If they disagree with the values of the communities they work in, the can try political education. They can try to teach and persuade and convince people to change their values. But they

---

* North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation. First California Conference on Educational Evaluation and Public Policy, 1976, ed. Nick Rayder. University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N.D. 58202, February 1977.

should not stomp on people and presume the right to set values regardless of what people believe and want for their children. One of the main reasons so many schools are becoming armed camps to protect the teachers and administrators from students and parents (an insane situation) is because so-called professionals have presumed the right to set values for people, and therefore never found it necessary to ask or listen."

From a university professor of organizational administration:

GUY BENEVISTE: "This (falsification of measurements) is obvious if not well-documented. The consequence is further anomie. The study of organizations in this country has paid little attention to the effects of corruption on organizations, but corruption can have very severe repercussions, particularly on professionals whose training does not prepare them for such behavior.

When positive outside evaluations are perceived to be very important for the continuation of a program, we expect members of the organization to be tempted to falsify results. Whether they do depends on many factors: their own subjective evaluation of the evaluation; the ease with which numbers can be manipulated; the commitment they may have to the program, etc. etc. I tend to think that in education the opportunities for falsification are numerous, possibly far more numerous than in other social sectors such as health or nutrition.

The probem with falsification is twofold. First, we know even less about what works and what fails. Second, we have created a new kind of false profession, composed of individuals who really do not care at all about education but care only to look good in evaluations, and that is very serious indeed.

Last, but not least, evaluation should be part of the search for knowledge, part of learning. But in its organizational context--that is, in the context of the fear of punishment which accompanies outside evaluations--it is doubtful that much learning takes place.

One can easily describe the scenarios and stereotypes into which evaluation can degenerate: For the evaluators, the members of the organization being evaluated are unimportant, overcommitted, foolish, poorly informed, or clearly incapable. For the evaluatee, the evaluators are arrogant, wasteful of time and resources, committed only to studying instead of doing, uncommitted to "real" education. This is not a good learning situation.

Moreover, evaluation takes time--time which the practitioner may feel is being diverted away from the task at hand. It is easy for conflict to arise between these two groups, and even when the evaluators think they have the enthusiastic support and understanding of the evaluatees, they should think twice and look again.

From a university professor of child development:

KENNETH KENISTON: "We measure the effectiveness of education by whether or not it produces income increments, not by whether it

improves the quality of life of those who are educated. And we measure the success of schools not by the kinds of human beings they promote, but by whatever increases in reading scores they chalk up. We have allowed quantitative standards, so central to our adult economic system and our way of thinking about it to become the principal yardstick for our definition of our children's worth.

A related characteristic of our technological economy is its need for some mechanism to sort individuals into various occupational slots. The intellectualization of children by testing and tracking in school assists in classifying and sorting them for the labor force. By the time a poor, black, handicapped, or uncared-for child reaches fourth of fifth grade, a consistent position in the bottom track of the grade has become an almost inescapable adult destiny. Hence, although we talk about the other human qualities we cherish in children, when push comes to shove -- when it is a matter of promotions, credentials, and praise -- the child who has learned to master test taking gets the reward.

And this fact lives next door to our professed devotion to other human qualities we say we value more -- physical vitality, caring, imagination, resourcefulness, cooperation and moral commitment.

How to Promote Humanistic Evaluation

How can evaluators act to promote humanism in our profession? Probably the single most effective way is to involve those who are affected by the evaluation as participants in decisions identifying the focal objectives for the evaluation, determining the data to be collected, and formulating the conclusions and decisions that result.

There are other guidelines for the evaluator to insure humanization. The set on page 7 was generated by evaluators for use by the National Right to Read program.

GUIDELINES FOR HUMANISTIC EVALUATION*

1. The users of the evaluation should assist with setting the criteria for the evaluation, the evaluation design, and the conduct of the evaluation.

2. All methods and procedures used in the evaluation should be clear and understandable to those who will use the information.

3. Evaluation methods must insure protection of the individuals involved, and the methods used must be socially fair.

4. Evaluation design and procedures should cultivate a climate that encourages staff to seek and use data feedback as part of a natural inquiry process.

5. Collected information should encourage and be used for self evaluation and improvement.

6. The evaluation plan should allow for ongoing decisions on program effectiveness and program improvement.

7. The evaluation should document the way the instructional system influences and/or responds to the needs of the learner and staff working in the program.

8. Evaluation methods should document the effect of the project on how individuals are treated and responded to (e.g., the particular form of educational experience the student has should be documented.)

9. Evaluation methodology should be designed to view the learner as developing strengths (the asset theory of human development) and should allow a student to communicate knowledge and ability in ways that he/she is most competent. (For example, when assessing knowledge of facts, if the student can give more knowledge of facts using a pencil and paper test, then that method should be used, etc.)

10. The evaluation should include the assessment of students and teacher products as important educational outcomes.

11. Every evaluation plan, proposal, and/or report should contain a Human Impact Statement, the Human Evaluation Statement should describe and detail the effect of the evaluation on the lives, work, and interactions of those involved with it.

12. The form of experience required by the evaluation methodology should be congruent with the form of experience being delivered by the educational model being evaluated (i.e., the evaluation should be isomorphically valid).

Guideline 12, that the evaluation be isomorphically valid, is a new concept in educational evaluation. Its importance is explained in the second part of this paper.

---

* Thanks to Edward Smith of the National Right to Read Project and to Margaret Skutch of the Early Learning Center, Stamford, Conn. and John Hayman, University of Alabama for their contribution to these guidelines.

Part II Isomorphic Validity

An overriding, but virtually overlooked, evaluation principle that affects the fairness of the evaluation is the concept of Isomorphic Validity.

As a statistics student, I learned of "isomorphism" as it relates to measurement and statistical analysis. The concept was rather simple but critical in evaluation science since it is the foundation of the measurement process. In Siegel's non-parametric statistics book, isomorphism represents the relationship between the level of measurement obtained through the assignment of numbers and the appropriate statistic that can be applied to those measurement data. To the extent the assignment of numbers was isomorphic, with several specific rules, the powerful mathematical system can be used by social science research. For example, if an investigator was just assigning numbers to people to identify them as being male or female (using the nominal level of measurement) s/ne would have to use mathematical operations appropriate for ca egorical data. That is, the number of people who are males could be counted and the percentage of either sex could be determined. If the evaluator assigns numbers that reflected an ordinal level of measurement (assigned numbers indicated categories of events plus the characteristic that one category was more or less than the other), s/he could use more complex mathematical operations and statistics. As more mathematical conditions were satisfied in the assignment of numbers to the events studied, different statistics could be applied to the data. That is, to be scientific, to allow for certain statistical procedures, the evaluator's assignment of numbers must be "isomorphic" with certain mathematical principles.

The concept of "isomorphism" can also be used to depict congruence between evaluation procedures and the educational model being evaluated.

For example, there are a variety of separate and unique educational models. Some are based on a closer conceptualization and adherence to principles of B.F. Skinner's Behaviorism, other educational models may reflect a developmental model of human growth such as the work of Piaget, while other models posit an "open education" approach like the British Infant School. To be valid and fair, the evaluation procedures must be isomorphic with the way learners are treated and processed in the particular educational model. That is, the evaluation procedures and model must be isomorphic with the educational procedures and model. The way a child is treated in the evaluation process must be the same as the way a child is treated in the educational process. When an evaluation model that is not isomorphic with the educational model is used, we are making a gross error in educational evaluation. This error not only results in a great many inappropriate educational decisions, but moreover places an inordinate amount of stress and confusion on those involved or associated with the evaluation. This stress may result in undoing educational benefits.

At this point, an example of how the isomorphic validity principle can be applied is in order. Take, for example, the situation in which standardized tests are used as data collecting devices in classrooms espousing and implementing "open education" or the British Infant School educational model. In An Open Education Perspective on Evaluation (University of North Dakota Press, 1975) George Hein and Margaret De Rivera identify eight classroom practices that reflect the form of experiences built for children in the British Infant School educational model. These experiences, contrasted with the form of experience demanded of children when tested, demonstrate low isomorphic validity (see Table I, page 10).

Table I ISOMORPHIC VALIDITY IN EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Form of Experience in an Open Education Model	Form of Experience in a Standardized Testing Model
*1. Children are encouraged or at least allowed to share, to converse, to help one another.	No talking, no sharing, no helping one another.
2. Children exercise and demonstrate their knowledge and skills in many different modes: verbally, by action, dramatics, writing, etc.	The children's response mode is limited to listening for directions, reading, and marking. Knowledge and skills which they are used to exercising in one mode have to be translated to the mode or response that fits the test.
3. Flexibility is such that children can finish most tasks they begin and can go on to something else when finished. Children can move around the room, pursuing interests.	No moving on to the next task when finished, often not enough time to finish a task. Children must remain seated at a desk.
4. Children generally work at many different tasks, so that comparisons are not easy and competition is not encouraged.	Children work on the same task at the same time so that comparisons are facilitated.
5. Each child is viewed as a complex, unique individual, having strengths and weaknesses but essentially qualitatively different from others.	Quantitative differences between children are important, qualitative differences are lost. Success is defined by others' performance.
6. The child is given learning experiences designed to develop a self-image of a competent, effective successful person. This is considered an important attitude for effective learning.	The very children (those who are weakest in skills) who need the support of a positive self-image in order to continue learning, are discouraged and frustrated by failure.
7. Thoughtful, critical thinking is encouraged. Learners are guided to explore all possible outcomes for an event.	Often random guessing is a more successful strategy than thoughtfulness since the tests are limited in time. Thoughtfulness is not always rewarded.
8. Intrinsic motivation (i.e., learning for learning's sake) is considered the most effective motivation for long-term learning.	Extrinsic motivation (i.e., learning for some outside reward) is encouraged; learning in order to pass the test or to get the highest score.

* Taken from work by Margaret DeRivera and George Hein in An Open Education Perspective in Education, University of North Dakota Press, 1975.

The concept of isomorphic validity can also be described and understood as it relates to curriculum evaluation. First, consider the three different educational models outlined in Table II on pages 12 and 13.

TABLE II EDUCATIONAL MODELS -- Three Examples*

MODEL A	MODEL B	MODEL C
EDUCATIONAL VALUES/OBJECTIVES		
Bringing learner behavior in sync with specific stimuli.	Bring wide and complex range of stimuli under learner control.	Control and introduction of stimuli minimal. Encourage all stimuli to influence learning.
Most content preset by adults.	Some content preset by adults.	Most content set by learners.
Subject matter and academic skills have priority, self-concept enhanced by skills.	Learning content, problem solving skills and self-concept operate simultaneously.	Learning how to learn, socio-emotional development, self-determination valued first.
WHAT IS TO BE LEARNED		
Curriculum clear and specific usually published, identified by adults for ability levels.	Curriculum choices identified by adults in response to developmental stage, ability, and interest.	Curriculum identified by learners guided by adults (teachers, parents, community, etc.)
Objectives dispensed by teachers texts, workbooks and other media. Scope and sequence specific, set by curriculum developers.	General sequence of objectives understood. Sequence and scope set by adults and learner.	Curriculum objectives incidental, emphasis on inquiry, making decisions, concluding--reflect learner's experience and problems. Scope and sequence evolve
Specific directions from lesson toward specific outcomes/ behaviors.	Directions responsive to learner, offer alternatives to a goal.	Directions open, suggestive, evocative.
ROLE OF ADULTS		
Direct and respond.	Guide and respond.	Respond with unconditional positive regard.
Direct learning along prescribed lines based on behavior of learner.	Interact to assist the learner's development along several dimensions (simultan.).	Be a resource person for learners.
Keep focus on specific objectives and dispense reinforcement for responses according to plan.	Prepare environments to stimulate learning. Question, provide feedback and interpersonal support for inquiry.	Support self-actualizing of learners. Assist in achieving learner purposes, encourage.
Explain, communicate, direct correct, and reinforce behavior in desired directions.	Stimulate, challenge, model, allow for match between children's present stage of development, knowledge & curriculum.	Encourage learning, and protect the learner from overwhelming failure, assure the child of own worth and potential.
ROLE OF LEARNERS		
Learners primarily responders: follow particular defined learning path, proceeds thru sequenced activities to predefined objectives on task behavior/initiation follows.	Learners primarily interactors-interact with environment, to solve problems, discover, etc. Learner participates in deciding what & how to learn.	Learners primarily initiators--initiate based on own needs & interests--learner is prime decision-maker regarding what and how learning occurs.

* Developed with William Baker, Alameda County Schools, Ca. & with helpful input from Marion Lobowitz and Terri Roeder, Albany Ca. Schools and Lynn Blair, U. of Washington.

TABLE II (Continued)

MODEL A	MODEL B	MODEL C
WHAT MOTIVATES LEARNERS		
Primarily extrinsic--to please adults or others--gain reinforcement for task accomplishment. Intrinsic motivation follows. May be competitive.	Primarily intrinsic--to please the learner and others-adults and peers. May be competitive.	Intrinsic--to please the learner. Lack of competition obvious.
LEARNING OUTCOMES		
A specific, predictable product-skills, knowledge, understanding. Low variability--high similarity of products, high completion rate.	Many task related products produced and they can be predicted. Variability--dissimilarity of products, completion rate varies. Process--learner able to find answers to questions s/he doesn't know the answer to.	Large numbers of products. Products unpredictable. Wide variability and dissimilarity of products. Products unpredictable. Wide variability and dissimilarity of products. Many outcomes in wide range of areas. Completion rate varies considerably.
EVALUATION		
Largely demonstrated behavior teacher made or standardized assessment instruments. Assessment built into curriculum procedures are defined for the learner and monitored repeatedly. Large use of standardized & criterion referenced tests. The learner compared to self, standards, national and local norms. Some process evaluation of task delivery process, focus on objective data.	Multiple devices used for assessment and behavioral change in wide areas. Learners and adults define assessment procedures. The learner participates in self-assessment. May use standardized or criterion referenced tests. The learner primarily compared to individual development in relationship to stages of her/his development. Much process evaluation: adult/child interaction, learner feelings, experiences, products etc. Competency tests, observation, some ethnography, some analysis of products, some case study.	Based on student developed goals and objectives as evidence by products/process. The learner decides whether and how to assess. The learner asks for another's appraisal. Standardized tests not used. Data does not lend to standard analysis. Documentary--describing what has transpired. Case study, observation, ethnonographic, sociological, testimonials.

From Table II it should be clear that each model reflects a difference in underlying values and objectives for education. Models also differ on what is taught in the classroom, how teaching takes place, the role of the learner, and on the educational outcomes. While there is often overlap in some areas, the differences set apart the models. As such the evaluation methodology must also be different.

> Evaluation procedures must not only evaluate specific educational objectives espoused by the model (content validity) but also be conducted in a way that is consistent with the educational process espoused by the model (Isomorphic Validity).

That is, if the educational model encourages the learner to take an active part in the educational process, then the program evaluation must allow the learners and other stakeholders an active part in its determination as well. Or, if the educational model encourages learners to gain their knowledge in a variety of ways, then the evaluation procedures must include a variety of ways for the learner to demonstrate that knowledge. The way learners are treated in the evaluation procedures should be consistent with the way learners are treated in the educational model.

Much of the instrumentation and methodology for evaluation in Model A is in place (yet improvement is still needed). Evaluation methods for Models B and C are now emerging in our profession. What should be crystal clear, however, is that using the Model A evaluation strategy and methods to evaluate Models B and C is invalid--isomorphically invalid.

For an evaluation to be isomorphically valid, its form and content must be consistent with the form and content of the particular program which is being evaluated. To the extent that there is isomorphic validity, evaluation efforts will result in useful data for decision-making and evaluators will improve their stance with students, parents, school personnel, and curriculum developers. The question of cross-model comparison (which model is best?) is complex and not the intent of this paper. In passing. however, this author

feels that the only defensible basis on which educational models can be compared is on the extent to which stated objectives have been satisfied, and the form of experience they offer the learner.

The notions of HUMANISTIC EVALUATION AND ISOMORPHIC VALIDITY must be integrated into current evaluation methodology if evaluators are to keep pace with social and curriculum demands.

The demand for a more humanistic approach and the concept of isomorphic validity are especially important with new federal legislation to integrate children with disability into regular public school classrooms. This group of children are particularly susceptible to classification and labeling. Ironically, it is also the group for which classification and categorization and labeling is most damaging. The move to integrate children with physical, emotional or cognitive learning differences must eliminate labeling. While records of children with disabilities are necessary for the appropriation of funds, the labeling process can be contained to administrative files. And while special conditions or disabilities must be known and understood to allow for educational programming, those conditions and disabilities should remain divorced from the educational process. As an alternative, a child should be known by the special service or individualized program designed for him. Under such a plan, no labeling is necessary.

While it is legislated that test results must "comprise only one part of the child's IEP,"* it may loom (be understood, be used, be weighted) as the single most referred to index of growth. Its simplicity, its mesmeric power, may guarantee its supremacy in the decision making process.

Yet, by default, the integration of the disabled may contribute to more humane testing. Many disabled children defy group testing, some cannot hold a pencil, others will not be as patient or docile as the non-disabled.

---

*Federal Register on 94-142 legislation.

The data collector will be required to do individual testing, to use other methods for recording responses, and to be more concerned with attitudes and feelings. This can only help the testing movement. And, as parents become more aware of their rights with regard to IEP's (individual educational plans) and their necessary involvement in planning and evaluation processes, the child's closest advocate will insist evaluation procedures insure the child's well-being. Further, the integration of special needs children will have implications on the evaluation of all students. When parents of the non-disabled learn of the effective way public education can be designed to meet and evaluate children's individual needs, they too will demand their role in developing and evaluating educational plans for their children.

NFR:jc
2/13/79

SELECTED WORK THAT SUPPORTS WHOLISTIC-HUMANISTIC EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

1. A series of monographs that encouraged a re-examination of a range of evaluation issues and perspectives about schools and schooling. Write:

   North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation
   c/o Dr. Vito Perrone
   Center for Teaching and Learning
   University of North Dakota
   Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

2. Dr. Egon Guba's to be published book:

   Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry
   In Educational Evaluation
   By Dr. Egon Guba
   Indiana University, School of Education
   2805 East 10th Street
   Bloomington, Indiana 47401

3. Work by Urie Bonfrenbrunner on "Ecological Validity"

   "The Experimental Ecology of Human Development" (Mimeo)
   Cornell University
   Ithaca, New York

4. Bob Stake and Responsive Education

   Evaluating the Arts in Education
   Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company
   Columbus, Ohio 1975

5. Articles in Anthropology and Education Quarterly, Vol. VIII, No. 2 May 1977
   Special issue:

   "Exploring Qualitative/Quantitative Research Methodologies
   in Education" edited by William Tikunoff and Betty Ward
   "Language Assessment: Where, What and How" p. 83ff
   Cortney Cazden with Jim Bond, Ann Epstein, Robert Mate
   and Sandra Savignon

6. Elliott Eisner's work on connoisseurship as a model for educational evaluation:

   The Perceptive Eye: Toward the Reformation of Educational
   Evaluation
   By Dr. Elliott Eisner
   Occasional papers of Stanford Evaluation Consortium
   Stanford, California

7. A concept paper by John Hayman and others on the aggregation and use of educational data, 1977:

   "On Aggregation, Generalization and Usefulness of Educational
   Evaluation -- A New Principle"
   By Dr. John L. Hayman, et al.
   School of Education
   University of Alabama
   Tuskaloosa, Alabama

8. A paper by N. Rayder and Bart Body describing the Form of Experience concept

   The Form of Educational Experience
   Dr. Bart Body
   Far West Educational Laboratory
   1855 Folsom Street
   San Francisco, CA 94103